

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-7 and 9-22 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 3, 7, 9, 13, 14, 16, 18, 20 and 22 are amended. No new matter is added by these amendments. Reconsideration of the application based on the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by Examiner Ke at the interview held March 8, 2007 are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

The Office Action, on page 2, rejects claims 1, 3-7, 9-14, 16-18 and 20-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,115,720 to Bleizeffer et al. (hereinafter "Bleizeffer") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,543,857 to Wehmeyer et al. (hereinafter "Wehmeyer"). Additionally, the Office Action, on page 8, rejects claims 15 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bleizeffer, Wehmeyer, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,751,953 to Shiels et al. (hereinafter "Shiels"). The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

The Office Action asserts that Bleizeffer teaches many of the features as recited in the subject matter of the pending independent claims. However, the Office Action concedes that Bleizeffer does not teach displaying items with their parameters. The Office Action relies on Wehmeyer to overcome this deficiency of Wehmeyer. This assertion is incorrect.

Bleizeffer teaches, as argued in the November 17, 2006 Request for Reconsideration, and the March 8 personal interview, a method and apparatus for compensating for deficiencies existing in programs to assist the user through installing a program. Bleizeffer teaches initially presenting the user with a welcome screen, Fig. 2, upon which the user selects the action they wish to choose. From the welcome screen, the user is taken through a

sequence of a plurality of menus that allow the user to edit and/or select options that the user intends on using (col. 4, lines 58 through col. 5, line 6). For example, if the user selects a first option from the welcome menu, then the user would be redirected to a window as shown in Fig. 6. As the user, as taught by Bleizeffer, proceeds through the plurality of menus, Figs. 2-21, they are assisted in installing a program. However, at no time does the invention of Bleizeffer display a **single menu frame**, as recited in the subject matter of the pending claims that: (1) displays items which have been already set along with their set parameters; (2) displays items which are being set along with parameters to choose from; and (3) displays items which have not been assigned and not yet been set, being displayed in the single frame of the display device so as to be distinguishable from one another. The Office Action incorrectly refers to Fig. 18 as teaching many of the features recited in the pending claims. Fig. 18 of Bleizeffer simply teaches a health check view which presents a predefined job, which can be divided into smaller jobs (col. 13, lines 30-35). As such, specifically with respect to Fig. 18, items which have already been set along with their set parameters, items which are being set along with parameters to choose from, and items which have been assigned and not yet been set are not displayed in the single frame of the menu frame illustrated in Fig. 18. The Examiner could not refute the arguments as presented, however, he reserved the right to further review any formal filing.

The Office Action asserts that Wehmeyer teaches displaying items with their parameters and that it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine Wehmeyer with Bleizeffer. However, as previously argued, and as argued during the personal interview, and as discussed above, Bleizeffer does not teach, nor would it have suggested, (1) displaying items which have been already set along with their set parameters; (2) displays items which are being set along with parameters to choose from; and (3) displays

items which have not been assigned and not yet been set, being displayed in the single frame of the display device so as to be distinguishable from one another.

Additionally, the combination of Wehmeyer does overcome the deficiencies of Bleizeffer, in that the reference does not teach, nor would it have suggested, displaying all of the features as enumerated above on a single screen, as positively recited in the pending claims. The Office Action only addresses the display of the parameters by applying Wehmeyer, but does not address the deficiency of Bleizeffer, of displaying, in a single frame all of the plural items, as positively recited in the pending claims.

Additionally, neither Bleizeffer nor Wehmeyer teach, nor would have suggested, that after setting of a first item, "a setting frame of a second item that is next to the first item in the predetermined order is displayed, and the first item is turned an item which has been already set; and an item which has been already set, an item which is being set along with parameters to choose from, and an item which has not yet been set are displayed in the single frame so as to be distinguishable from one another," as positively recited in amended claims 1, 7, 13, 14, 16, 18, 20 and 22.

Bleizeffer teaches, referring to Fig. 12 and col. 11, lines 29-39, that the user highlights and sets the fields in question and is then returned to the previous window. Wehmeyer and/or Shiels, in any permissible combination, do not overcome the deficiencies, as identified above, of Bleizeffer, as applied to the subject matter of the pending claims.

For at least the above reasons, Bleizeffer, Wehmeyer and Shiels cannot reasonably be considered to teach, or to have suggested, the combinations of all of the features recited in at least independent claims 1, 7, 13, 14, 16, 18, 20 and 22. Further, claims 3-6, 9-12, 15, 17, 19 and 21 would also not have been suggested by the applied prior art references for at least the respective dependence of these claims on the allowable independent claims, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 3-7 and 9-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of applied prior art references are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1, 3-7 and 9-22 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Kirk D. Berkhimer
Registration No. 59,874

JAO:KDB

Date: April 30, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--